

IDAHO SDI PROJECT

SUMMARY NOTES FROM JUNE 27 EXECUTIVE MEETING AND STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Prepared, 7-14-2008

Introduction

This meeting was organized by the GIO to bring together a number of senior officials and decision makers to provide high-level briefing about the SDI project and get initial input and ideas to support SDI planning work. The meeting was conducted from 7:00 to 9:00am at Elmer's Restaurant in Boise and provided an informal setting to meet key people, provide project background, and do some brainstorming.

Meeting Participants and Contact Information

Name	Organization	Phone/Email Address
Gail Ewart (Project Manager)	Idaho Geospatial Office, State GIO and SDI project manager	208-332-1879, gail.ewart@cio.idaho.gov
Peter Croswell (Consultant Facilitator)	Croswell-Schulte IT Consultants, contracted facilitator and project manager	502-848-8827, pcroswell@croswell-schulte.com
Anne Kawalac (Steering Committee member)	Ada County Assessor	287-7261, akawalac@adaweb.net
Tony Morse (Steering Committee member)	Idaho Dept. Water Resources	Tony.morse@idwr.idaho.gov
Nick Nydegger (Steering Committee member)	State of Idaho Military Division and Idaho Geospatial Committee (IGC) Chair	208-272-4182, nick.nydegger@id.ngb.army.mil
Invited Attendees:		
Greg Zickau, State CTO	Idaho Office of the CIO, Department of Administration,	Greg.Zickau@cio.idaho.gov
Bryant Ralston	ESRI	bralston@esri.com
Garry Beatty, CIO	City of Boise	gbeatty@cityofboise.org
Dave Tuthill, Director	Idaho Dept. of Water Resources	Dave.Tuthill@idwr.idaho.gov
Phyllis King, Representative	Idaho House of Representatives	pking@house.idaho.gov
Kathy Opp, Deputy Director	Idaho Dept. of Lands	kopp@idl.idaho.gov
Dave Hoover, Deputy Director	National Resource Conservation Service-Idaho Office	David.Hoover@id.usda.gov
Bob McQuade, Assessor	Ada County	rmcquade@adaweb.net
Charles Trainor, Director of Planning and Development	Compass	ctrainor@compassidaho.org
Gene Kuehn, Assessor	Canyon County	gkuehn@canyonco.org

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction
- SDI overview and status of geospatial coordination in Idaho
- Ideas on business justification for enhanced SDI
- Overview of key issues: governance structure, formal mandate, garnering support and SDI financing
- Open discussion: ideas and strategy for SDI governance and financing

Gail Ewart kicked off the meeting with a presentation explaining of the SDI project, key concepts driving the project, explanation of the current geospatial program organizational structure, and brief summary of the current

status. Consultant Peter Croswell followed with a presentation on business drivers, financing approaches, and key issues impacting SDI planning and moving ahead with SDI development. This initial presentation was followed by an open discussion that included questions and ideas about SDI planning and development. The meeting was successful and a good opportunity to generate some initial interest and support as well as providing ideas on key areas to focus on in the SDI planning process.

After the Executive Session was adjourned, the Executive Steering Committee met briefly to review project status and brainstorm organizational and business focus ideas for the SDI plans.

Summary Notes from Executive Session

Below is a list of key topics touched on in this meeting:

- A question was asked about what would be the cost for statewide SDI development. This question was not answered directly since the planning process is at an early stage. But reference was made to money being spent now, which is in the tens of millions of dollars, in an uncoordinated manner. Croswell/Ewart Commentary: This order of magnitude includes all geographic-related activities, whether or not labeled GIS.
- In addition to getting some idea of cost, Representative King was interested in getting a better picture of the project status, its basis, and overall status of SDI development and operations in Idaho. Croswell/Ewart Commentary: This brings up the important point that many people to whom we want to “sell” this project do not have background about geospatial program history or status, so it will be necessary to provide some good overview, explanatory materials and use these effectively for high-level audiences.
- It was noted that the presentation by Ewart and Croswell did not make much mention of federal government participation in the project or the statewide SDI. It was explained that federal agencies have a significant involvement in this planning project and that active participation of and coordination with federal agencies is a critical element of the SDI.
- Some discussion about the plusses and minuses of selling GIS data and products. It was acknowledged that this can be a valuable revenue source in some cases to support GIS programs but the general sense was that, overall, establishing major fees for GIS data from public agencies could inhibit wide use and expansion of GIS activities and support. Several mentioned that providing data free or at nominal cost could be an incentive or stimulant to effective use of GIS technology (public and private sectors).
- Some discussion of the use of a Recorder fee to support a special fund for GIS development. General agreement that this is a viable funding mechanism and should be pursued.
- Gene Kuehn made reference to a special fund in Canyon County for “Technology Development.” This is an effective budgeting and accounting practice to support IT- and GIS-related development.
- A question was asked about the existence of formal agreements between agencies to support geospatial data sharing and development. Croswell/Ewart Commentary: A comprehensive approach to data sharing would streamline agreement negotiation and administration, such as having a master license agreement for data sharing between state agencies and counties.
- The point was made that it is important to prepare budget request materials for the 2010 budgeting process. Croswell Commentary: Need to examine timing in more detail and what steps need to be taken for making a budget request AND getting support for this prior to submittal. Ewart Commentary: Timing is better for FY11, since FY10 budget deadlines are imminent.
- Point was made that it is important to engage the Governor’s office and get support at that level as soon as possible. Discussion about how best to do this—through the CIO, agency directors? Croswell/Ewart Commentary: a specific approach for Governor’s Office communication was not determined, but it is important to identify avenues for contact. Could be via Gov. Geringer in upcoming meeting with Gov. Otter, with Director Gwartney in attendance. Important to keep CTO Zickau informed on progress and make contact soon with Director Gwartney. Need to approach Mike G soon (with Greg Z). Another approach may be to conduct briefing for all state agency directors in Governor’s Cabinet Session. This will require alignment with key themes, initiatives being emphasized by the Governor.
- Mention was made about importance of private sector involvement. IACI was specifically identified.
- Mention was made about importance of University involvement. Assurances that universities are deeply involved.
- Ralston of ESRI mentioned a two-day executive event in Montana. Croswell/Ewart Commentary: Should follow up with Bryant to see if this could be a model for an event in Idaho.
- Question was asked whether this project will result in an inventory on “who is doing what” in the geospatial community in Idaho. It was explained that we are using a survey tool to gather information. Croswell/Ewart Commentary: Getting a comprehensive picture of status and activities may be difficult since it is dependent on a voluntary response from survey recipients. This was an optional part of the Croswell-Schulte proposal which was offered and agreed, but there are not

contact \$\$ available for direct contact with recipients to solicit responses or to do much follow-up on responses. May need to nudge recipients to get a reasonable percentage response.

- Several key business drivers and selling points were identified:
 - Economic development – Dept of Commerce geopro prospector application; serve the real estate industry
 - Case for efficiency gains and savings in labor time
 - Emergency management and public safety
 - Support for expansion of broadband access (mention was made of the “Kentucky Connect” program and Connect the Nation)
 - Observation that small businesses and jurisdictions need data but don’t want internal GIS capabilities
 - Figure out how to leverage regional tendencies and institutionalize same
 - Observation that this initiative is timely.
- Attendees cited the need for executive summary materials, good presentation materials to explain and sell the concept
- The importance of communication with professional groups was mentioned (e.g., IAC, IAHD, others). Also important to engage state committees (E911 Committee, Public Safety Committee)
- Point was made that small (low population) counties and cities need support. This includes resources for GIS access and implementation (including options for outsourcing), as well as guidance and clear standards to follow.
- Example of “nontraditional” use of GIS is the new Web-based 511 site for traffic information. Croswell/Ewart Commentary: This was mentioned as an example that is not GIS but uses GIS information. Fact is, this is exactly the type of application and program we need to emphasize to show the value of GIS technology and spatial databases.
- It will be a good idea to site examples from other states to help build the plan
- Suggestion of road trip with decision-makers to successful jurisdictions
- Suggestion to select top three priorities for funding

Addendum: Strong and Weak Aspects of Existing GIS Coordination Governance and Organization Situation

Established by Executive Order, the Idaho Geospatial Committee has broad representation of all major stakeholder groups. As a subcommittee to ITRMC:

- IGC lacks decision-making authority
- Representation has been delegated down to technical level in many cases
- Representatives are inconsistent in communicating with their stakeholders
- Service terms vary: Chair changes every one or two years & only a state agency rep can be Chair
- Standards and other policies and decisions are only binding on state entities.

Some data has been assembled in statewide datasets--2004 imagery and surface waters & watersheds—but many more are needed: road centerlines, parcels, elevation, to name just a few. IGC has not adopted any Framework data standards.

The Geospatial Information Officer leads the Idaho Geospatial Office to coordinate and enhance Idaho’s GIS capabilities, but the IGO has no operating funds to leverage and align GIS investments, activities and opportunities, resulting in duplication of effort, missed opportunities and data that cannot be integrated. Moreover, the IGO is understaffed.

We depend on INSIDE Idaho, our official clearinghouse, but it lacks stable funding, is understaffed, and is unable to replace aging equipment and modernize its services to meet increasing demand.

Regional GIS user groups are gaining momentum and expanding missions, but not coordinating with each other and often acting outside the statewide coordination structure.

Despite heavy reliance on agency-volunteered resources, we are making progress, but lack of understanding at senior management levels can make consistent participation a challenge. With dedicated resources, we can accelerate the effort and realize the benefits more quickly.